

SEMINAR FOR COUNCILS OF STATE AND SUPREME ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTIONS

28 JANUARY 2008, BRUSSELS

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Information and public participation in environmental issues

Secondary Community law makes provision for procedures to inform the public of environmental data and for citizen participation in the development of projects that are likely to impact the environment.

The two main texts in force are Directive 2003/4/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003 on public access to environmental information and repealing Council Directive 90/313/EEC; and Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment as later amended.

Other international texts, such as the Aarhus Convention of 25 June 1998 or Article 8 of the European Convention for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms also apply and the European Court of Human Rights ruled, on the basis of these texts, that member states had an obligation to provide information on environmental matters.

A - Application of regulations

Has the respective application scope of these texts, and the Community directives in particular, led to disputes? How has national case law clarified the concepts contained in these texts considering, in particular, the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities?

For example, has the establishment of the party to be consulted, as provided for under Directive 85/337 and referred to as the "public concerned", ever been the subject of litigation? If so, how did your court settle the matter? Do you feel that the explanations provided on this matter by

Directive 2003/35/EC, which modified the previous directive, such as the concepts of the public "likely to be affected" by a project or "having an interest in" a procedure to authorise a given project, clarify the scope of the text?

B - Judge control techniques

How much control does the administrative judge exercise over the administration's compliance with its obligations to inform citizens and facilitate public participation? In other words, how much discretion does it allow the administration in this regard? And what sanctions are issued when the judge observes that one of the obligations not been met?

The consultations provided for under Directive 85/337/EEC may take place during long and complex procedures before official permits are issued. Does failure to comply with obligations systematically lead to the simple annulment of the permit? Or does case law show that annulment is reserved for cases where the irregularities observed are substantial? Is it possible to make the entire or part of the procedure compliant?

C - Open question

In addition to the two previous questions, has your court issued other decisions on waste law or polluting installations law that should be noted? If yes, please summarise these decisions in a few lines.

2. Pollution law (example of polluting installations)

Secondary Community law on waste and polluting installations represents an attempt to reconcile economic growth with environmental protection.

The two main texts in force in this regard are framework Directive 2006/12/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 5 April 2006 on waste (which replaces Directive 75/442/EEC) and Directive 96/61/EC of the Council of 24 September 1996 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control.

A - Application of regulations

How are responsibilities distributed under your national legislation in connection with the restoration of polluted sites? Does the selection of the party responsible (operators of sites or holders of waste) raise problems? Moreover, is it possible, in certain cases, to question the responsibilities of the public authorities in charge of applying the regulation in the event that they have not sufficiently exercised their powers to monitor and control industrial manufacturers?

Directive 96/61, for example, makes provision for the satisfactory rehabilitation of an operating site once operating activities have been completed. Problems can arise when the relevant public authority intends to exercise its supervision and control powers to end pollution that emerges after operating activities have ended. For example, can these powers be exercised immediately? Against which party: the former operator, the current owner? Can the responsibility of the relevant authority be applied due to a shortcoming in the exercise of its prerogatives?

B - Judge control techniques

What is the scope of the powers of a judge ruling on a dispute concerning the application of one or other of these regulations? Are there procedural regulations or rules of evidence before the judge or procedures for establishing specific facts connected with these matters, given, in particular, their specific technical nature?

When asked, for example, to rule on the decision taken by the relevant authority on the request for prior authorisation provided for under Directive 96/61, is the judge only permitted to annul the decision? Or may the judge also amend the decision or impose other measures?

What rules for the transfer and taking of evidence does the judge apply to settle the dispute? Can the judge request special investigation measures (e.g. expert opinions or amici curiae)?

C - Open question

In addition to the two previous questions, has your court issued other decisions on waste law or polluting installations law that should be noted? If yes, please summarise these decisions in a few lines.